

Appln. No.: 09/988,924
Amendment Dated June 19, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 21, 2007

MATP-612US

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-24 and 26-31 are pending in the above-identified application.
Claims 4, 6, 8 and 25 are cancelled.

Claims 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Jiang et al.
Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection.

With regard to claim 13, Jiang et al. does not disclose or suggest,

... generating an intra-field interpolated pixel value for the target pixel position;

generating a non-linear inter-field interpolated pixel value for the target pixel position; and

combining the intra-field interpolated pixel value and the non-linear inter-field interpolated pixel value in a proportion determined by the degree of movement in the region to produce an output interpolated pixel value for the progressive scan video image. (Emphasis added).

Basis for this amendment may be found in original claims 4, 6 and 28.

The Examiner has indicated, at page 15 of the Office Action, that Jiang et al. fails to anticipate the limitations of claim 28, namely,

... an intra-field interpolator which generates an intra-field interpolated pixel value;

a non-linear interpolator which generates an non-linear interpolated pixel value; and

a weighted averaging circuit that combines the intra-field interpolated pixel value and the non-linear interpolated pixel value in proportion to the static level value to produce an output interpolated pixel value for the progressive scan video image. (Emphasis added).

Claim 13, while not identical to claim 28, includes limitations similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 28. Thus, claim 13 is also not subject to rejection for the same reasons as indicated by the Examiner with regard to claim 28. Claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 13. Accordingly, claims 14 and 15 are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of Jiang et al.

Appln. No.: 09/988,924
Amendment Dated June 19, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 21, 2007

MATP-612US

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Jiang et al. and Kim et al. As described above, Jiang et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 13. The Examiner asserts that Kim et al. teaches generating a non-linear inter-field interpolated pixel value. Kim et al. does not, however, disclose or suggest **combining the intra-field interpolated pixel value and the non-linear inter-field interpolated pixel value** in a proportion determined by the degree of movement in the region to produce an output interpolated pixel value for the progressive scan video image, as recited in claim 13. Thus, claim 13 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Jiang et al. and Kim et al. Claim 16 depends from claim 13. Accordingly, claim 16 is also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Jiang et al. and Kim et al.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, 19-20 and 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Jiang et al. and DeHaan et al. The rejection of claim 4 is moot due to the cancellation of claim 4. With regard to claim 1, neither Jiang et al., DeHaan et al., nor their combination disclose or suggest,

... (c) generating a plurality of potential values for an interpolated pixel at the target pixel position, including **generating an intra-field interpolation value and a non-linear inter-field interpolation value;**

(d) **selecting the intra-field interpolation value and the non-linear inter-field interpolation value** from the plurality of potential values responsive to the determination of whether said target pixel position lies on an edge and the determined degree of movement in the region of the target pixel position;

(f) **blending the intra-field interpolation value and the non-linear inter-field interpolation value** according to the degree of movement determined in step (b) to generate the value for the interpolated pixel. (Emphasis added).

Basis for this amendment may be found in original claims 4, 6 and 28.

As described above, the Examiner has indicated that Jiang et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 28. The Examiner has also indicated that DeHaan et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 28. Claim 1, while not identical to claim 28, includes limitations similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 28. Thus, claim 1 is also not subject to rejection for the same reasons as indicated by the Examiner with regard to

MATP-612US

Appln. No.: 09/988,924
Amendment Dated June 19, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 21, 2007

claim 28. Claims 2, 5 and 7 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2, 5 and 7 are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Jiang et al. and DeHaan et al.

Claim 19, while not identical to claim 28, includes limitations similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 28. Thus, claim 19 is also not subject to rejection for the same reasons as indicated by the Examiner with regard to claim 28. Claims 20 and 23-24 depend from claim 19. Accordingly, claims 20 and 23-24 are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Jiang et al. and DeHaan et al.

Claims 6 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Jiang et al., DeHaan et al. and Kim et al. The rejection of claim 6 is moot due to the cancellation of claim 6. As described above, Jiang et al. and DeHaan et al do not disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 19. Kim et al. also does not disclose the limitations of claim 19. Claim 21 depends from claim 19. Accordingly, claim 21 is also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Jiang et al., DeHaan et al. and Kim et al.

Claims 3 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Jiang et al., DeHaan et al. and Shin et al. As described above, Jiang et al. and DeHaan et al. do not disclose or suggest the limitations of claims 1 and 19. The Examiner has also indicated, at page 15 of the Office Action, that Shin et al. fails to anticipate the limitations of claim 28. Because, as described above, claims 1 and 19 include limitations similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 28, claims 1 and 19 are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Jiang et al., DeHaan et al. and Shin et al. Claims 3 and 22 depend from claims 1 and 19, respectively. Accordingly, claims 3 and 22 are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Jiang et al., DeHaan et al. and Shin et al.


Applicants appreciate the indication in the Office Action that claims 18 and 28-31 are allowed. Applicants also appreciate the indication in the Office Action that claims 9-12, 17, 26-27 and 30 would be allowable if amended to be independent and to include all of the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims. Applicants note that the Examiner has allowed claim 30 at page 14, item 11 of the Office Action and has also objected to claim 30 as being allowable if amended to be independent and to include all of the limitations of its base claim. Applicants assume that this is a minor error and that claim 30 is allowed. Because, as described above, claims 1, 13 and 19 and 28 are in condition for allowance, no amendment to claims 9-12, 17, 26-27 is needed.

Appln. No.: 09/988,924
Amendment Dated June 19, 2007
Reply to Office Action of March 21, 2007

MATP-612US

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objections to claims 9-12, 17, 26-27 and 30 and the rejection of claims 1-7, 13-16 and 19-24.

Respectfully submitted,


Kenneth N. Nigon, Reg. No. 31,549
Attorney(s) for Applicant(s)

KNN/pb


Dated: June 19, 2007

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 18-0350 for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (571-273-8300) on the date shown below.

June 19, 2007


Patricia C. Boccella

P_H:\NRPORTBL\RP\PCBOCCCELLA\133666_1.DOC